

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-13, 15, 16 and 18-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 19 and 20 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Claims 29 and 30 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in these claims. Reconsideration of the application based upon the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed below; and (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Gelagay during the June 3, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of a summary of the substance of the personal interview is contained in the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4, 15, 19, 20, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0219127 to Russ et al. (hereinafter "Russ") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,295 to Saito; rejects claims 11-13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,952 to Blakley III; rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ in view of Saito and U.S. Patent No. 5,805,706 to Davis; rejects claims 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ in view of Saito and Blakley III; and rejects claims 21-23, 25 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ in view of Saito and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184518 to Foster et al. (hereinafter "Foster"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Russ and Saito, in combination, would have rendered obvious the combination of all of the features recited in independent claims 19 and 20. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, claims 19 and 20 are amended to include the subject matter recited in now-canceled claims 29 and 30, respectively.

The Office Action asserts that Russ and Saito do not teach the deciding device (1) decides based on a job classification information of the input data that the data decrypted by the decryption module is to be printed without the encryption module encrypting the data, and (2) instructs to execute a print process associated with the inputted data after deciding that the data decrypted by the decryption module is to be printed without the encryption module encrypting the data, as recited in claim 19 and now-canceled claim 29, and similarly recited in claim 20 and now-canceled claim 30. To cure these deficiencies, the Office Action applies Foster. Foster, however, does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, at least the above-quoted features recited in claim 19.

For example, the Office Action asserts that Foster teaches features that allegedly correspond to these features in paragraphs [0096]-[0099]. In paragraphs [0096]-[0099], Foster teaches that the job ticket service controls job content access, updates job ticket as processes are completed, completes the job ticket and reports when all processes are completed for a specific job ticket. Foster, however, does not disclose, (1) decides based on a job classification information of the input data and (2) instructs to execute a print process associated with the inputted data after deciding that the data decrypted by the decryption module is to be printed without the encryption module encrypting the data, as recited in claim 19 and similarly recited in claim 20.

During June 3 personal interview, Applicants' representative presented the above arguments to the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that further consideration upon the filing of a formal response would be required.

Additionally, Russ, Saito and Foster are not combinable in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Russ is directed to a master-receiver and a subscriber television network that receives service instances (Abstract). Saito is directed to a re-encryption apparatus for ensuring protection of digital data (Abstract). In contrast, Foster, as discussed above, is directed to a job ticket service. Foster, however, only uses an authorization infrastructure in the context of preventing processors from accessing bids and information from any other processor in the context of the job ticket structure. It is unreasonable to assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Foster with Russ and Saito in the manner suggest to achieve a predictable result at least because Foster does not contemplate the decryption and encryption analysis disclosed by either Russ or Saito, and certainly not the sophisticated structure recited in the pending claims. Further, for at least this reason, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the references in the manner suggested.

The Office Action's conclusory statement regarding combining Russ, Saito and Foster to allow users to generate specific tasks and to control the requested task accordingly does not meet the articulated standard required to demonstrate obviousness. The Federal Circuit recently reaffirmed its prior holdings asserting that "rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statement; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006). See also the Supreme Court's reasoning in *KSR v. Teleflex*, requiring explicit "articulated reasoning with a rational underpinning" to support a legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, No. 04-1350, slip op. at 14 (2007), citing *In re Khan* 441 F.3d 997, 998 (Fed. Cir. 2006). This standard is not met here as no articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning is provided in order to meet the standard of obviousness required by the judicial precedent for combining these references in

the manner suggested. In particular, the Office Action's asserted motivation to allow users to generate specific tasks and to control the requested task accordingly is without consideration of the differences between the disclosures of the applied references, as discussed above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applied references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 19 and 20. Additionally, claims 2-13, 15, 16, 18 and 21-28 are also not taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of 2-13, 15, 16 and 18-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of 2-13, 15, 16 and 18-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II  
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:CJW/cxc

Date: June 18, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--